United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/30/TKM/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
28 February 2018

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirtieth session
7-18 May 2018

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Turkmenistan*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 11 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[2]

2. It was recommended that Turkmenistan ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance[3] and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.[4]

3. The Human Rights Foundation (HRF) noted that Turkmenistan had not yet ratified the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure.[5]

4. The HRF recommended that Turkmenistan ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.6 The Center for Global Nonkilling (CGNK) recommended

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

GE.18-03090(E)
1803090

Please recycle

that Turkmenistan ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, as recommended[7] during the second review.[8]

5. Joint Submission (JS) 3 reported that Turkmenistan had failed to respond to communications from the United Nations Working Group on Enforced Disappearances concerning several cases.[9]

6. JS1 noted that the national action plan on human rights for 2016-2020 committed to new visits of the special procedures mandate holders of the Human Rights Council. However, JS1 reported that many requests from the special procedures mandate holders had been pending for decades and that only the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief visited the country in 2008. The Government has not issued a standing invitation to the special procedures mandate holders.[10] HRF recommended that Turkmenistan extend invitation to and/or respond to requests for visits from various Special Rapporteurs as well as the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention.[11] Furthermore, JS1 recommended that the Government draw up a plan and schedule to facilitate visits by all special procedures mandate holders who have requested to visit the country.[12] The World Alliance for Citizen Participation (CIVICUS) and JS3 made similar recommendations.[13]

B. National human rights framework[14]

7. JS1 observed that the authorities adopted the first national action plan on human rights, established the Office of the Ombudsman and adopted new legislation related to human rights since its previous universal periodic review. JS1 stated that while those steps were welcome, they had failed to translate into any significant improvements in practice, and that the Government continued to restrict or deny basic rights and freedoms.[15]

8. JS1 noted the lack of institutional safeguards for the independence of the Office of the Ombudsman. It stated that the Parliament selected Ombudsman among candidates proposed by the President.[16]

9. CIVICUS recommended that the Government implement transparent and inclusive mechanisms of public consultations with civil society organisations and enable the effective involvement of civil society in the preparation of law and policy, and systematically consult with civil society on the implementation of recommendations from the universal periodic review.[17]

10. CIVICUS recommended that the authorities incorporate the results of the upcoming universal periodic review into its action plans on human rights and present a midterm evaluation report to the Human Rights Council on the implementation of the recommendations.[18]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person[19]

11. JS1 reported that the 2012 amendment to the Criminal Code incorporated an article, criminalising torture. However, the authorities had not applied the provision in practice and claimed that they had received no complaints about torture and ill-treatment from detainees since the new provision entered into force.[20] JS1and JS3 noted, however, that there had been credible reports of widespread use of torture and ill-treatment in detention places.[21]

JS1 recalled that Turkmenistan received recommendations[22] from its second review to conduct independent investigations into all torture allegations and punish the perpetrators.[23]

12. JS1 recommended that Turkmenistan ensure that the provision on torture of the Criminal Code is applied in practice and that any allegations of torture and ill-treatment are promptly, thoroughly and impartially investigated, and the perpetrators are prosecuted and receive penalties commensurate to their crimes.[24] JS3 and HRF made similar recommendations.[25]

13. JS1 reported that enforced disappearances and the use of arbitrary, incommunicado and politically motivated detention have continued.[26] It stated that dozens of individuals previously imprisoned after closed trials remained forcibly disappeared. The authorities denied them visits, letters, or any other contacts with their families, who had not received any information about their fate or whereabouts in custody for years.[27] Similarly, HRF reported that 19 Turkmen were arbitrarily taken into custody at the end of 2016, without presenting arrest warrant to them and without informing them of charges behind the arrest. It reported that they were subject to torture and ill-treatment during interrogation and were held incommunicado in pretrial detention. The detainees were not given opportunity to communicate with their families, and did not have access to their lawyers during their pretrial detention. They were tried in a closed trial and their right to due process was violated, concluded HRF.[28]

14. JS3 reported on a growing number of prisoners who had been kept in full isolation, without any contact with the outside world. Among such prisoners were those who convicted of an alleged attempt to assassinate then President Saparmurat Niyazov, former high officials charged with different economic crimes and persons accused of Islamic extremism. It stated that there had been no verifiable information about whereabouts and condition of those persons since their arrest or trial - with a few exceptions when the authorities returned the bodies of deceased prisoners to their families.[29] JS3 reported on a growing number of deaths of persons held incommunicado in prisons after being many years of isolation in harsh conditions of prisons.[30]

15. JS1 stated that individuals convicted on politically motivated grounds or in politically charged cases were reportedly subject to abusive treatment in detention. In many cases, they were believed to be held in the high-security Ovadan Depe prison.[31] JS3 made similar observations and reported that torture was widespread in Ovadan Depe prison. It noted reports that cells of Ovadan Depe maximum-security prison were completely isolated and communication between cells were forbidden. Some cells had covered up windows. Water inside cells was filthy and the toilet was inside the cell without respect for the privacy of inmates. Food was scarce and of poor quality. In the few cases were bodies of disappeared prisoners were returned to families, they reportedly showed signs of starvation.[32]

16. JS3 reported that Turkmenistan agreed to implement a recommendation from the universal periodic review of 2013 on the rights of persons serving long prison sentences according to international standards.[33] However, the Government had not taken any steps to implement the recommendation and refused to recognise the problem. The authorities denied access of international humanitarian organisations to prisoners whose names were on the lists of the disappeared. Relatives of the victims of disappearances were subjected to systematic pressure, including travel bans and threats.[34]

17. JS1 recommended that Turkmenistan end the practices of enforced disappearance and arbitrary and incommunicado detention; provide information about the fate and whereabouts of all those who have disappeared in prison and grant them access to their lawyers and family members; and promptly release all who have been convicted on politically motivated grounds in closed, unfair trials.[35] JS3 made similar recommendations.[36]

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[37]

18. JS1 reported that the authorities carried out a program of reform and reconstruction of the penitentiary system. A new women's prison was opened in the Dashoguz region in 2013. These measures led to improvements in conditions for some categories of detainees. However, conditions in other detention facilities reportedly remained dire, with overcrowding, undernourishment, widespread tuberculosis, and a lack of access to adequate medical care.[38] JS1 recommended that the authorities bring the conditions in all detention and prison facilities in line with international standards and requirements.[39]

19. JS1 stated that Turkmenistan lacked independent monitoring of places of detention to safeguard the rights of detainees and prevent abusive treatment. It reported that the government did not establish an independent national preventive mechanism, thereby failing to implement key recommendations from the universal periodic review of 2013.[40] It explained that monitoring commissions, established by a presidential decree of 2010 were composed of representatives of state institutions and thus, they were not independent entities. The new office of the Ombudsman had a mandate to conduct unannounced visits to places of detention and consider complaints from prisoners. JS1 noted, however, that there were no institutional safeguards for the independence of the office. It noted that it was unclear what resources the office of the Ombudsman had been granted for prison monitoring.[41]

20. JS3 reported that the International Committee of Red Cross withdrew from negotiations on cooperation with Turkmenistan, citing unwillingness of the authorities to accept standard requirements for prison visits of the International Committee of Red Cross.[42]

21. JS1[43] and JS3[44] recommended that Turkmenistan establish an independent national system for effective and regular monitoring of all places of detention without prior notice. JS3 recommended that the authorities ensure access to prisons, including the high security Ovadan Depe prison, for independent observers.[45] JS1 recommended that Turkmenistan grant the International Committee of Red Cross unhindered access to detention facilities, and allow it to carry out monitoring in accordance with its standard procedures.[46]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[47]

22. Forum 18 stated that no improvement in the enjoyment of the right to freedom of thought, conscience and belief had been recorded since the universal periodic reviews of the first and second cycles and that systematic violations of this right by the Government had continued.[48] It noted that the new law on religion (2016) included a ban on exercising freedom of religion or belief without state permission and an increase in the number of founders a religious community needed from 5 to 50. Religious communities, wishing to retain legal status were subjected to compulsory re-registration under the 2016 law.[49]

23. Forum 18 stated that the Government imposed a de facto ban on most religious publications and that the authorities routinely confiscated religious literature from residents and from people entering or leaving the country.[50] Forum 18 reported on restrictions on having a place to meet for worship and stated that raids on meetings of religious communities frequently happened. Many communities could not gather all their members together or only met in small groups for fear of raids by police.[51] The European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ) made a similar observation.[52]

24. Forum 18 stated that 14 mosques, Christian churches, and Hare Krishna temples were destroyed in the past years.[53] The Alliance Defending Freedom International (ADF International) stated that requests to recover church buildings and properties confiscated during the communist area from several churches had been ignored.[54]

25. Forum 18 stated that the Sunni Muftiate - the only form of Islam permitted – had been under tight control of the Government. The Justice Ministry named the Chief Mufti

and the Muftiate appointed imams to the district level. The authorities "recommended" to imams sermon topics for Friday prayers. Muslim young men in some regions were barred by the state from wearing beards. Women were banned from wearing a hijab (headscarf). The authorities allowed Sunni Islam to operate within tight limits, but obstructed Shi'a Islam.[55]

26. Forum 18 reported that state officials have continued to pressure non-Muslims to change their beliefs and to bully non-Muslim schoolchildren and their parents and guardians. Turkmen Protestants were reportedly summoned before their village or settlement and pressured to renounce Christianity.[56] Forum 18 stated that Protestants and Jehovah's Witnesses have often been jailed for periods of up to 15 days for exercising their freedom of religion or belief.[57] The ECLJ reported on several cases of imprisonment of Jehovah's Witnesses for refusing the compulsory military service on grounds of conscientious objection.[58]

27. The ADF International recommended that Turkmenistan remove burdensome registration requirements for religious groups and rescind intrusive governmental practices, including monitoring and raiding, remove criminal prohibitions on religious or belief communities operating on an unregistered basis and ensure that the right to manifest one's religion in private or in public is fully protected and realized. It recommended that the authorities release all prisoners of conscience who are incarcerated or arbitrarily detained because of their faith.[59]

28. JS1 stated that during the universal periodic review in 2013, Turkmenistan received several recommendations[60] on freedom of expression and the media, but it did not implement them.[61] JS2[62], the Reporters without Borders (RSF)[63] and CIVICUS[64] made similar observations. JS3 stated that the media and access to information remained under the control of the Government.[65] JS1 stated that the authorities controlled media outlets and interfered with their editorial policies.[66]

29. JS1 stated that the import of foreign newspapers has been restricted, and that the authorities have implemented campaigns to dismantle private satellite dishes that were used to access foreign television and radio stations.[67] The RSF[68] and JS3[69] made similar observations.

30. JS3 stated that the Government's control over the Internet has increased with the adoption of a law on internet in 2015.[70] JS1 stated that the Internet access remained restricted and that its speed was slow and the prices were high. Moreover, foreign media and websites of non-governmental organisations had been blocked. Access to social media and online communications applications were restricted and proxy sites used to circumvent the restriction were regularly blocked.[71] CIVICUS[72] and the RSF[73] made similar observations.

31. CIVICUS reported that defamation was a criminal offence under the Criminal Code. Defamation against President could lead to a sentence of up to five years in prison.[74]

32. JS1 recommended that the authorities enforce, in practice, the provisions of the law on media, safeguarding media pluralism, prohibiting censorship and allowing media to operate without government interference, and refrain from any form of intimidation and retaliation against social media users and others who seek to obtain or disseminate independent and alternative information about the situation in the country. It recommended that Turkmenistan end the practice of dismantling satellite dishes to ensure that residents can have unimpeded access to foreign sources of information, and promote unobstructed internet access and refrain from arbitrarily blocking access to news, social media and other websites.[75] JS3[76], the RSF[77] and CIVICUS[78] made similar recommendations.

33. The RSF reported that persecution of independent journalists had intensified in the past three years. Correspondents working for media outlets based abroad had become the main targets. The RSF stated that detention of journalists on trumped-up charges or for

unknown reasons and violations of the right to a fair trial have persisted. Relatives had also been subject to growing harassment by the authorities.[79] The RSF reported on several such cases, including the case of freelance journalist Saparmamed Nepeskuliev. A contributor to the RFE/RL's Turkmen Service and Alternative Turkmenistan News, Nepeskuliev was held incommunicado for weeks after he disappeared on 7 July 2015. His family was not informed of his whereabouts. He was then tried secretly without being represented by a lawyer and was given a three-year jail sentence on a trumped-up drug charge. The RSF observed that the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention described his imprisonment as arbitrary.[80]

34. The RSF recommended that Turkmenistan put an end to the harassments against journalists and correspondents and ensure that their safety is guaranteed.[81] CIVICUS recommended that the authorities ensure that journalists may work freely and without fear of retribution for expressing critical opinions or covering topics that the Government may find sensitive.[82]

35. JS1 stated that the 2015 law on assemblies allowed residents to hold peaceful assemblies if local authorities were informed in advance and provided their consent on the venue. The law prohibited assemblies in a number of places, including near government buildings, hospitals, schools and public transportation, as well as in "other places" deemed unsuitable by local authorities. Only one-person pickets could be held without prior notification.[83] CIVICUS made similar observations.[84]

36. JS1 reported that public assemblies were rare, likely due to the implicit threat of reprisals, but spontaneous protests on issues affecting the everyday lives of citizens reportedly occurred occasionally. Local authorities had responded to such protests by seeking to track down and warn the initiators.[85] In contrast, the Government mobilised and required citizens to take part in mass gatherings to celebrate national occasions and the President's visits to different parts of the country, reported CIVICUS.[86]

37. JS1 recommended that Turkmenistan abolish undue restrictions on peaceful assembly, including the requirement to hold assemblies in pre-designated venues and end the practice of forcibly mobilizing residents for participation in government-organized mass events.87 CIVICUS made similar recommendations.[88]

38. JS1 stated that the 2016 Constitution provided that the state should ensure the necessary conditions for the development of civil society. However, the civil society environment remained repressive.[89] CIVICUS noted that the Government supported several recommendations from the universal periodic review on the right to the freedom of association and on creating an enabling environment for civil society organizations. It concluded that the Government failed to take adequate measures to implement them.[90]

39. JS1 stated that the 2014 law on public associations retained the requirement for associations to obtain mandatory state registration and set out strict registration rules for nation-wide associations, which must have 400 members to gain registration.[91] CIVICUS was concerned by the 2017 amendments to the law, which introduced additional restrictions on civil society organizations, including by limiting their ability to register, run as independent organizations and receive funding from other countries.[92] JS1 explained that leading or participating in the activities of unregistered associations was subject to administrative sanctions.[93] CIVICUS reported that there have been only 118 civil society organizations, with 40 percent of those being sports-affiliated associations. Independent civil society organizations found it nearly impossible to register because of restrictive legal system, concluded CIVICUS.[94]

40. JS1 stated that legislation granted the authorities wide powers to monitor and oversee the activities and finances of associations without adequate safeguards against

abuse. Independent human rights organizations could not operate openly and individual human rights activists faced serious threats of government retaliation.[95]

41. JS1 recommended that Turkmenistan abolish the requirement for non-governmental organisations to obtain compulsory state registration in order to operate lawfully in the country, as well as the administrative penalties foreseen for involvement in unregistered associations. It recommended that Turkmenistan ensure that any non-governmental organisations that so wish may obtain legal status in a fair and transparent process and carry out their activities without undue government interference.[96] Likewise, CIVICUS recommended that Turkmenistan amend the law on public associations to remove undue restrictions on the freedom of association and bring its provisions into compliance with articles 21 and 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.[97]

42. CIVICUS noted that Turkmenistan received several recommendations on the protection of human rights defenders and civil society representatives. However, the Government had not implemented any of them.[98] JS1 reported that civil society activists and others who dared to criticize government policies faced threats, harassment and imprisonment.[99]

43. CIVICUS recommended that Turkmenistan release all human rights defenders detained for exercising their rights to freedom of associations, expression and peaceful assembly and review their cases to prevent further harassment. It recommended that Turkmenistan ensure that human rights defenders are able to carry out their legitimate activities without fear or undue hindrance, obstruction or legal and administrative harassment.100 JS1 recommended that Turkmenistan carry out prompt, impartial and thorough investigations into all allegations of arbitrary detention, torture, physical assaults and other human rights violations targeting civil society activists and dissidents, and hold the perpetrators accountable.[101]

44. JS1 stated that during its first review, Turkmenistan received a recommendation[102] to abolish the Propiska system. However, this Soviet-era residence registration system had still remained in force and has been enforced in ways that limited the right to movement and other rights.[103] JS1 recommended that Turkmenistan ensure that residence registration requirements are not used to limit the right to freedom of movement, social and economic rights or other fundamental rights of residents.[104]

45. JS3 stated that Turkmenistan accepted a recommendation from the universal periodic review of 2013 to amend its law on migration to comply with its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. However, arbitrary and politically motivated restrictions on freedom of movement, particularly on travel abroad, had still been practiced widely, affecting an estimated 20,000 people, many of whom had received lifelong travel bans. The Constitution did not include the right to leave the country and return. The law on migration cited national security interests as one of the grounds to restrict travel abroad. JS3 stated that the absence of a constitutional guarantee, the vagueness of the relevant legal provisions, the lack of legal criteria or definitions of national security created the grounds for arbitrary and often politically motivated bans on leaving the country. The authorities established a large blacklist of persons denied the right to leave the country. Virtually any security agency in Turkmenistan could impose a travel ban. The procedure was extrajudicial as no court order was required.[105] JS1 made similar observations.[106]

46. JS1 recommended that Turkmenistan end arbitrary ban on citizens leaving the country and the use of so-called blacklists, prohibiting targeted individuals from travelling abroad. It recommended that the authorities abolish the broadly worded grounds for restricting travel abroad under the law on migration and ensure that anyone subject to a travel ban has the right to appeal that decision.[107]

47. The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE/ODIHR) concluded in its report that the 2017 presidential election took place in a strictly controlled political environment. The predominant position of the incumbent and the lack of genuine opposition and meaningful pluralism limited voters' choice. The lack of clear regulations for key aspects of the process had a negative impact on the administration of the election, especially at lower levels. The campaign outside of the events organized by Central Election Commission for Election and Referenda was absent and the rigidly restrained media gave the incumbent a clear advantage.[108]

48. The report of the OSCE/ODIHR contained 27 recommendations to the authorities in order to improve further the electoral process in law and practice. In particular, the OSCE/ODIHR recommended that the authorities bring election legislation in accordance with the OSCE commitments and other international standards for democratic elections, establish measures to prevent serious electoral malpractices like proxy voting, multiple voting and ballot box stuffing and introduce temporary special legislative measures to promote women's political participation.[109]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery[110]

49. JS2 reported that each year during the cotton harvest the Government has forced public sector workers including teachers, doctors and nurses to pick cotton, or hire a replacement worker to pick cotton under threat of punishment including loss of wages and termination of employment. People forced to pick cotton also had been compelled to sign declarations of 'voluntary' participation in the harvest. Officials forced private businesses to contribute workers, or contribute financially or in-kind, under the threat of closure.[111] JS2 stated that the Government maintained total control of cotton production and forced farmers to deliver state-established, annual cotton production quotas under the threat of penalty including loss of their land.[112]

50. JS2 stated that despite measures taken by the Government to prohibit the involvement of children in harvesting cotton, the pressure to fulfil cotton-picking quotas led to children picking cotton alongside their parents.[113]

51. JS2 recommended that Turkmenistan inter alia enforce national laws that prohibit the use of forced labour and child labour, and fully implement its obligations under International Labour Organisations Conventions nos. 29 and 105 on forced labour, and establish and implement a time-bound national action plan to address forced labour in the cotton sector and its root causes.[114]

2. Economic, social and cultural rights

Right to an adequate standard of living[115]

52. JS1 reported on the failure of the Government to provide adequate compensation to residents whose homes it expropriated and demolished for large-scale urban reconstruction, infrastructure, and beautification projects in the years leading up to the 2017 Asian Indoor and Martial Arts Games. It noted that the law entitled expropriated homeowners either to an alternative equivalent living space or to financial compensation for expropriated homes, but in many cases, the compensation apartments were worth significantly less than the total worth of homeowners' property, or were too small for the family's needs. In other cases, authorities evicted homeowners before their compensation apartments were fully constructed, forcing residents to pay a place to live until they were ready. In other cases, conditions in compensation apartments were poor, in buildings with leaks, non-functioning elevators, and other problems. JS1 stated that the authorities forced homeowners to accept "upgraded" apartments in exchange for their demolished homes, but demanded that

families pay the difference beyond the assessed worth of their homes and that of the "upgraded" apartment, and denied them the title to the new property until they paid.[116]

53. JS1 recommended that Turkmenistan ensure that Ashgabat homeowners and residents, who had been forcibly evicted, get fair and adequate compensation for the loss of their property and costs incurred due to the forced evictions.[117]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.

Civil society

Individual submissions:

ADF International	Alliance Defending Freedom International (Geneva, Switzerland;
CIVICUS	World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Johannesburg, South Africa;
CGNK	Center for Global Nonkilling, Honolulu, United States of America;
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg, France;
Forum 18	Forum 18 News Service, Oslo (Norway);
HRF	Human Rights Foundation, New York (United States of America);
RSF	Reporters Without Borders, Paris (France).

Joint submissions:

JS1	**Joint submission 1 submitted by**: Human Rights Watch (Switzerland, United States of America), International Partnership for Human Rights (Belgium) and Turkmen Initiative for Human Rights (Austria);
JS2	**Joint submission 2 submitted by**: Anti-Slavery International (United Kingdom), Alternative Turkmen News (ATN) and The Cotton Campaign – a global coalition (United States of America);
JS3	**Joint submission 3 submitted by**: Member organizations of the Prove They Are Alive! Human rights campaign, including the Center for Development of Democracy and Human Rights (Russia), Crude Accountability (United States of America), Freedom Files (Russia), Human Rights Center Memorial (Russia) and the Norwegian Helsinki Committee (Norway).

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

OSCE/ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Warsaw, Poland.

[2] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/3, paras. 113.1-113.13, 118.16-113.19, 113.30-113.47 and 113.58.

[3] JS3, p. 5, HRF, p. 9 and CGNK, p. 3.

[4] JS1, para. 4.11 and JS3, p. 7.

[5] HRF, p. 3.

[6] HRF, p. 9.

[7] For the full text of the recommendation, see A/HRC/24/3, paras. 143.18 (Estonia and Slovenia).

[8] CGNK, p. 3.

[9] JS3, p. 4.

[10] JS1, para. 3.10. See also HRF, p. 3 and JS2, para. 9.

[11] HRF, p. 9.

[12] JS1, para. 3.11.

[13] CIVICUS, para. 6.5 and JS3, p. 7.

[14] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/3, paras. 112.3-112.10, 113.22-113.29.

[15] JS1, para. 1.1.
[16] JS1, para. 4.9.
[17] CIVICUS, para. 6.6.
[18] CIVICUS, para. 6.6.
[19] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/3, paras. 113.21 and 113. 60, 113.70, 113.71 114. 2, and 114. 5.
[20] JS1, para. 4.2. See also Forum 18, para. 4 and HRF, p. 7.
[21] JS1, para. 4.2 and JS3, p. 5.
[22] For the full text of the recommendations, see A/HRC/24/3, paras. 113.21 (USA) and 113.70 (Spain).
[23] JS1, para. 4.1.
[24] JS1, para. 4.11.
[25] JS3, p. 7 and HRF, p. 9.
[26] JS1, para. 4.3. See also CIVICUS, paras. 3.4 and 3.5.
[27] JS1, para. 4.5.
[28] HRF, pp. 6, 7 and 8. See also CIVICUS, para. 3.5.
[29] JS3, pp. 2-3.
[30] JS3, p. 4.
[31] JS1, para. 4.7. See also CIVICUS, para. 3.5.
[32] JS3, pp. 5-6.
[33] For the full text of the recommendation, see A/HRC/24/3, para. 113.72 (Germany).
[34] JS3, p. 4.
[35] JS1, para. 4.11.
[36] JS3, p. 5.
[37] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/3, paras. 112,57, 113. 58, 113.61 -113.66 and 113.72.
[38] JS1, para. 4.8.
[39] JS1, para. 4.11.
[40] See also JS3, p. 5.
[41] JS1, para. 4.9.
[42] JS3, p. 6.
[43] JS1, para. 4.11.
[44] JS3, p. 7.
[45] JS3, p. 7.
[46] JS1, para. 4.11. See also JS3, p. 5 and 7.
[47] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/24/3, paras. 112.59-112.65, 113.21, 113. 73-113.90 and 114.3, 114. 6-114.8.
[48] Forum 18, para. 1.
[49] Forum 18, para. 2. See also ECLJ, paras. 4-5 and ADF International, paras. 5-10.
[50] Forum 18, para. 27.
[51] Forum 18, paras 19 and 22-24.
[52] ECLJ, para. 6.
[53] Forum 18, para. 25.
[54] ADF International, para. 13.
[55] Forum 18, paras. 13-15.
[56] Forum 18, paras. 19-21. See also ECLJ, paras. 8-11.
[57] Forum 18, para. 10. See also See also ECLJ, paras. 12-17.
[58] ECLJ, para. 18.
[59] ADF International, para. 15. See also ECLJ, para. 19.
[60] For the full text of the recommendations, see A/HRC/24/3, paras. 112.62 (Germany), 112.63 (Switzerland), 112.64 (Norway), 113.78 (Poland), and 113.84 (United Kingdom).
[61] JS1, para. 2.1.
[62] JS2, para. 27.
[63] RSF, p. 1.
[64] CIVICUS, para. 4.1.
[65] JS3, p. 10.
[66] JS1, para. 2.3. See also RSF, p. 3 and CIVICUS, paras. 4.2 and 4.5.
[67] JS1, para. 2.4.

[68] RSF, p. 3.
[69] JS3, pp. 10-11.
[70] JS3, p. 10.
[71] JS1, para. 2.5.
[72] CIVICUS, para. 4.4.
[73] RSF, p. 3.
[74] CIVICUS, para. 4.3.
[75] JS1, para. 2.7.
[76] JS3, p. 11.
[77] RSF, para. 3.
[78] CIVICUS, para. 6.3.
[79] RSF, p. 2. See also JS3, p. 11, JS1, para. 3.8, CIVICUS, para. 3.3 and JS2, paras. 27-32.
[80] RSF, p. 2. See also OSCE/ODIHR, p. 8, JS3, p. 11 and JS2, para. 32.
[81] RSF, p. 3.
[82] CIVICUS, para. 6.3.
[83] JS1, para. 3.5.
[84] CIVICUS, paras. 5.2 and 5.3.
[85] JS1, para. 3.6.
[86] CIVICUS, para. 5.4. See also JS1, para. 3.7.
[87] JS1, p. 3.11.
[88] CIVICUS, para. 6.4.
[89] JS1, para. 3.2.
[90] CIVICUS, para. 2.1.
[91] JS1, para. 3.3. See also CIVICUS, para. 2.3.
[92] CIVICUS, para. 1.4. See also paras. 2.2 and 2.5.
[93] JS1, para. 3.3.
[94] CIVICUS, para. 2.6. See also JS1, para. 3.3.
[95] JS1, paras. 3.3 and 3.4. See also CIVICUS, paras. 2.4-2.5.
[96] JS1, p. 3.11.
[97] CIVICUS, para. 6.1.
[98] CIVICUS, para. 3.1. See also JS1, para. 3.1.
[99] JS1, para. 3.8. See also CIVICUS, paras. 3.3-3.5 and JS2, paras. 27-32.
[100] CIVICUS, para. 6.2. See also JS2, para. 33 and JS3, p. 11.
[101] JS1, p. 3.11. See also RSF, p. 3 and JS2, para.33.
[102] For the full text of the recommendation, see A/HRC/10/79, para. 69.16 (Norway).
[103] JS1, paras. 5.1 and 5.2.
[104] JS1, para. 5.8.
[105] JS3, p. 7.
[106] JS1, paras. 5.6 and 5.7.
[107] JS1, para. 5.8. See also JS3, pp. 9-10.
[108] OSCE/ODIHR, p. 2.
[109] OSCE/ODIHR, p. 2.
[110] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/3, paras. 112. 29, 113.48, 113.78, 113.84.
[111] JS2, paras. 5, 10 and 11.
[112] JS2, paras. 6, see also para. 23.
[113] JS2, para. 12.
[114] JS2, para. 26.
[115] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/24/3, paras. 112.66, 112.67, 112. 72 and 112.73.
[116] JS1, paras. 6.2-6.5.
[117] JS1, para. 6.7.